

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/910,071	07/23/2001	Mayumi Tomikawa	522.1921D2	2943	
21171	7590 06/24/2003				
	IALSEY LLP		EXAMI	EXAMINER	
	ORK AVENUE, N.W.		BORIN, MI	BORIN, MICHAEL L	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1631	8	
			DATE MAILED: 06/24/2003	_	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/910,071

Applicant(s)

arre(3)

Examiner

Michael Borin

Art Unit 1631

Tomikawa et al.



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
	for Reply	
THE !	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
mailing	date of this communication.	
- If NO p - Failure - Any re	period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply a to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	nd will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. le application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/4/03	
2a) 🗌	This action is FINAL . 2b) 💢 This action	ion is non-final.
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance e closed in accordance with the practice under Ex par	except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is reference Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposi ⁻	tion of Claims	
4) 💢	Claim(s) <u>1-23</u>	is/are pending in the application.
4	la) Of the above, claim(s) 1-12 and 16-23	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.
6) 💢	Claim(s) <u>13-15</u>	is/are rejected.
7) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.
8) 🗌	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Applica	ition Papers	
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) \square accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the di	rawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply t	o this Office action.
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	ner.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign pr	iority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) 🗀	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:	
	1. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been received.
	2. \square Certified copies of the priority documents have	e been received in Application No
	application from the International Burea	
	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	
14)∟	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	
a) ∟ 15\□		
15)∟ 4•••••	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. 33 120 and/or 121.
Attachm 1) 👿 No	ent(s) stice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).
$\tilde{}$	tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	6) Other:

Art Unit: 1631

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1-23 are pending. It is noted that applicant refers to a Preliminary

amendment cancelling some of the pending claims; however, no such amendment was

allocated.

Response to restriction requirement filed 04/04/2003 is acknowledged.

Applicant elected, without traverse, Group II, claims 13-15. Claims 1-12,16-23 are

withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being

drawn to a non-elected groups. Cancellation of claims 1-12,16-23 is requested.

Title, Abstract

The title and abstract of the invention are not descriptive. The title and abstract

do not reflect the elected invention. A new title and abstract are required which are

clearly indicative of the invention to which the elected claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1631

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims, step (a), recite dividing second point set to make it the same size as the first set point. As the claims encompass both situations when the second point set is larger and smaller than the first set, it is not clear for the latter situation how the set can be divided if it might be already smaller than the first set.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C.102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by US 4,853,871 or Holak et al. (J. Mol. Biol., 210, 635-648) or Flaherty et al. (Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA, 88, 5041-5045) or Mosimann et al. (Proteins:Structure, Function and Genetics, 14, 392-400, 1992).

Art Unit: 1631

The instant claims are drawn to method of analyzing three-dimensional structures by generating correspondence between set points describing two three-dimensional structures and calculating root mean square distance (rmsd between the corresponding elements. As such, the claims read on any reference teaching comparison of two three dimensional structures and calculating rmsd therefor. The following references are exemplary of this commonly used approach to comparing 3-D structures.

US 4,853,871 describes method for evaluating protein's structure comprising comparing first set of three-dimensional coordinates of two amino acid residues with geometric conformation (i.e, with second set of three-dimensional coordinates) possessed by atoms of a disulfide bond. See claims 1,2,6, for example.

Holak et al. teach comparing three-dimensional structures of 34 structures of trypsin inhibitor with minimized mean structure, and calculating rmsd between the structures. See abstract.

Flaherty et al. describes comparison of muscle actin and heat shock cognate protein and demonstrate that calculating of rmsd between comparable spatial fragments shows close similarity of the structure of these proteins. See abstract.

Mosimann et al. describe comparison of molecular models of P-30 protein and pancreatic RNAse. The all atom supoerposition of active site residues of the P-30 and

Art Unit: 1631

an identically minimized RNAse structure has a root square deviation of 0.52A. See abstract.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321° may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 13-15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1,14 of U. S. Patent No.6,453,064. The referenced claims are drawn to an "extraction apparatus", which is a set of means to execute the instantly claimed method; therefore, the instant method will, obviously, be executed by the referenced apparatus.

Conclusion.

Art Unit: 1631

No claims are allowed

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Borin whose telephone number is (703) 305-4506. Dr. Borin can normally be reached between the hours of 8:30 A.M. to 5:00 P.M. EST Monday to Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Michael Woodward, can be reached on (703) 308-4028. The fax telephone number for this group is (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

June 20, 2003

MICHAEL BORIN, PH.D PRIMARY EXAMINER

mlb